UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/785,865	02/15/2001	Matthias Breuer	P-4899	6332

7590 03/08/2005

Forrest Gunnison
Gunnison, McKay & Hodgson, L.L.P.
Suite 220
1900 Garden Road
Monterey, CA 93940

EXAMINER	
BASHORE, WILLIAM L	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2176	

DATE MAILED: 03/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/785,865	BREUER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	William L. Bashore	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *24 August 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-17* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-17* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *15 February 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *1/18/2005*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: amendment filed 8/24/2004, to the original application filed 2/15/2001, foreign priority date **2/16/2000**. IDS filed 9/9/2002, and 1/18/2005.

2. Regarding IDS filed 1/18/2005, it is noted that the references have been stricken, since said references have been previously considered in IDS filed 9/9/2002.

3. Claims 1-17 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being described by Turbo C++ Version 4.5.

4. Claims 1-17 pending. Claims 1, 7, 8, 14 are independent.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. **The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:**

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. **Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being described by Turbo C++ Version 4.5, Borland International, 1995 (hereinafter Borland), application and help screenshots pages 1-15.**

In regard to independent claim 1, Borland discloses a method of formatting (colors and attributes) a document using either "Color SpeedSetting", and/or customized "Syntax Highlighting" (Borland pages 3-4, 8, 13-14). Borland discloses (on pages 12, 14) a sample document (settest.cpp) containing various objects and blocks, said objects (i.e. void, char, etc.) having directly assigned attributes (bold) via default settings of the Borland editor, as well as user customization (compare with claim 1 "*A method of formatting a computer-*

readable document comprising a plurality of objects having directly-assigned attributes, the method comprising".

Borland discloses reading a typical text document (see Borland page 12) (it is noted that a typical text editor (i.e. Word) does not recognize previously shown attributes of this file – see Borland page 15). Borland discloses detection of various objects (i.e. reserved keywords, void, comments, etc.). These objects have been previously assigned as shown above. It is noted that in addition to choosing a set of preset styles (Borland page 13), a user has the capacity to further assign/modify attributes individually to objects, therefore further defining the chosen style (see Borland page 14 – an integer can be bolded, italicized, underlined, and/or assigned a different color, etc.). When <OK> is pressed, Borland remembers this customization, along with other settings dictated by the chosen preset style, and applies this to future inputted documents (compare with claim 1 "*detecting objects, in said computer-readable document, having directly-assigned attributes, wherein attributes in said directly-assigned attributes were assigned individually to objects by a user;* ").

Borland discloses automatic creation of a (default or customizable) conversion style element for each object listed (Borland pages 13-14; compare with claim 1 "*creating, automatically, a conversion style element for every detected combination of directly-assigned attributes in the computer-readable document*"). It is noted that certain words are designated bold, and text comments proceeded with "//" are italicized. It is also noted that an initial "default" style is used pending user customization.

Borland discloses replacing the detected object styles with the same objects altered by directly assigned attributes (i.e. bold, italicizing, etc.) via "SpeedSetting", or user customization (Borland pages 8, 12; compare with claim 1 "*replacing directly-assigned attributes....corresponds to said directly-assigned attributes.*").

In regard to dependent claim 2, Borland discloses detecting unique combinations of style elements assigned to various objects as shown in Borland pages 6, 13-14.

In regard to dependent claim 3, since Borland is an electronic document editor application intended to be run on a computer, it is well known in the art that typical computers and operating systems comprise and utilize RAM memory portions for opening and running said applications and files.

In regard to dependent claim 4, Borland discloses user customization of each detected object (Borland pages 13-14). In addition, a user can cause the Borland editor to ignore all customization highlighting by renaming the document extension, or declare an extension for detection (Borland page 5).

In regard to dependent claim 5, Borland disclose a text document (Borland page 12). Said file (settest.cpp) is a typical text file as shown by Borland page 15 (opened using Word).

In regard to dependent claim 6, Borland discloses naming each style element (i.e. comment, Integer, Bold, Italic, Underline, etc.) (Borland page 14).

In regard to independent claim 7, claim 7 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 1, and in further view of the following, is rejected along the same rationale.

Borland discloses user customization of each detected object (Borland pages 13-14). In addition, a user can cause the Borland editor to ignore all customization highlighting by renaming the document extension, or declare an extension for detection (Borland page 5; compare with claim 7 "*receiving a request from a user*").

Borland discloses detecting unique combinations of style elements assigned to various objects as shown in Borland pages 6, 13-14 (compare with claim 7 "*unique detected*").

In regard to claims 8-13, claims 8-13 reflect the system comprising computer readable instructions used for performing the methods as claimed in claims 1-6, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to claims 14-17, claims 14-17 reflect the computer program product comprising computer readable instructions used for performing the methods as claimed in claims 1, 2, 4, 6, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 8/24/2004 have been fully and carefully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues on page 7 of the amendment that the Examiner appears to be interpreting "*directly-assigned attributes*" differently than disclosed in the specification. It is respectfully noted that Applicant defines directly-assigned attributes on at least page 8 of the Specification, lines 18-37. A user directly assigns attributes "bold" and "underline" to text accordingly with additional reference to Figures 3A – 3D. In addition to the intitial default style that Borland uses (Borland's styles comprise mappings of attributes to various text), a user can directly assign "bold", "underline", etc. type attributes (as well as colors) to various textual parts of a document (i.e. integers, comment symbols, strings, etc.) (Borland page 14). Borland remembers this for future "automatic" conversion of inputted documents.

Applicant further argues on page 8 of the amendment, that a default style dos not include directly-assigning attributes (by a user). It is respectfully noted that, as taught in the instant rejections, Borland teaches that a user can customize a style, item by item, if necessary. In addition, a "syntax element" can be interpreted as an object. For example, Borland page 14 shows that a user has directly assigned a "bold" attribute to text of type integer. Since Borland is a C/C++ editor, the skilled artisan is cognizant that Borland's "integer" means the "int" keyword in the C/C++ language, therefore, when Borland sees "int", it automatically transforms the textual keyword to "**int**". An int keyword can be fairly interpreted as an object.

Applicant further argues on page 8 (bottom) to page 9 of the amendment that a user is allegedly assigning attributes to a group of objects (e.g., all integer syntax in the document), and that the Examiner has

provided no teaching of further processing of such directly assigned attributes. It is noted that a user on Borland page 14 can apply bolding to an integer (the "int" keyword). Borland remembers (and references) this for future conversion. When Borland detects the word "int" in a document, it knows that the user has assigned (referenced) an attribute to it. Borland sees said attribute referenced as a "bold" conversion style element, therefore uses said reference to change "int" to "**int**", accordingly.

Applicant argues on page 9 of the amendment that the Examiner's teachings do not disclose the limitations of independent claim 7. It is noted that Borland remembers user customization for future "automatic" conversion of inputted documents. In addition, Borland teaches that a user can have the editor ignore all formatting by assigning a different extension to a document. This implies that a user wants Borland to apply formatting, as long as a user applies a special extension (i.e. .cpp, etc.) or other custom extension to the document. This is used to teach claim 7 "*receiving a request from a user*").

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William L. Bashore whose telephone number is (571) 272-4088. The examiner can normally be reached on 11:30am - 8:00pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild can be reached on (571) 272-4090. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

William L. Bashore

WILLIAM L. BASHORE
PATENT EXAMINER
TECH CENTER 2100
March 4, 2005